Pindar's Siegeslieder.   Erklärt von FRIEDRICH MEZGER.   Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1880.

Professor Mezger has undertaken in this work to supply the want of a commentary on the entire poems of the great lyrist, a commentary which shall comprehend the results of the years that have elapsed since Boeckh and Dissen, a period fruitful in special studies, not fruitful in connected exposition. For the text he refers us to Christ, Teubner, 1869, no text being given with the commentary.   Professor Mezger's object is to make the study of the poet easier; but while he endeavors to avoid all extraneous and learned disquisitions, he fears lest some of his remarks may seem superfluous to those who are acquainted with the subject.   In other words, he expects to run the risk of seeming to shut other men's hobbies out of the course for the pleasure of careering more freely on his own.

Professor Mezger has abandoned the Alexandrean order of the Odes, and has made a local division according to the home of the victors.   The principle is simple, and from certain points of view not without its utility, but it enhances the difficulty of reference so much that no practical editor would have followed it.   Each ode is preceded by an account of the personal history of the victor and his house, of the time and the place, a critical history of the interpretation down to the present day, and then a discussion of the text in detail. Upon this follows the distribution of the matter according to the Terpandrian νόμος, of which so much has been made of late years, and finally the question as to the basic idea of the poem and the way in which that idea is carried out. Such is the programme, and Professor Mezger has allowed himself 484 pages for the development of his ideal of a commentary on Pindar.

There are points in this programme to which one may take exception ; but on the whole it is not unattractive, and the reader might well be impatient to see how the work has been done.   But fortunately, or unfortunately, Mezger has made a discovery ; and if the glittering wealth of Pindar did not admit of so much discovery, one might be excited by the solemn tone in which that discovery is announced.   However, what he has to say is not more surprising than Furtwängler's architectural schemes of the Pindaric poems, and no fibre is stirred when it is announced that Pindar in every poem repeats one or more significant words in the corresponding verses and feet of his strophes, and that in these words we must look for the secret of his thought.   Mezger is not satisfied with a general correspondence : that would be nothing new.   We must have the same word, not the spirit but the body ; and he calls on us to notice the fact that in thirty-eight of the forty-four extant poems this repetition is found, and that the six excluded are of very narrow compass.   No stereotype expressions, no *epitheta ornantia* are counted among these repetitions, but only substantial and significant words.   It cannot be accident.   It must be design. And while Mezger does not go so far as Paley and his docile follower Fennell in depressing the age of a written literature in Greece, still he holds that in Terpander's time little use was made of writing, and that these repeated words served as cues, as mnemonic devices.   Pindar, he maintains, worked on the scheme of Terpander's νόμος, and succeeded to the mnemonic device as well, which is supposed to have had its counterpart in the technic of melody, accompaniment and rhythmical movement.   Then the public being of the same blood

with the chorus, became aware of this device, and the poets made further use of it to facilitate the understanding of their thought and kindly gave the key to their puzzles—the first syllables of the answer to their conundrums. In order to appreciate this revelation we must begin, says Mezger, with those poems in which the connexion of the repeated words with the main thought is clear, and then proceed to others in which, either through our own fault or *the poet's*, the references are not so striking. But if even in one solitary case it should be shown that the poet must have had a design, the fact of that repetition would gain a higher significance and challenge the most careful investigation.

This is the substance of the preface. It will be seen that the hobby begins to show its paces. The editor is under the dominion of a fixed idea, which of course has fastened itself on him with irresistible evidence. He would scout the concession of an element of truth. The partial truth must be universal. That is a widespread trouble. If the horses of the dawn will draw one chariot, they will furnish motive-power for the whole orrery of Olympus. If four bars constitute a favorite measure, then there must be four bars everywhere,—no more, no less. If Terpander's νόμος with its seven parts—Mezger gives it eight—works in one poem, make it work in all the others. If στιχομνϑία is the rule, take no account of the foreshortening of passion. Obelise every verse that interferes. And so we have hardly reached the end of the preface before we are convinced that the new editor of Pindar does not possess the calm judgment which were welcome in a man who has undertaken to gather up the results of the Pindaric work that has been done in the last fifty years.

Upon the preface follows a list of the games mentioned by Pindar, a catalogue which the author himself considers misplaced; then a brief sketch of Pindar's life and poetry, with a register of the chief editions, treatises, dictionaries, introductions and translations. We might expect in an edition which should give us the most valuable results of recent work on Pindar something about the dialect, something about syntax, something about the order of the words. He lays great stress on the rhythmical beauty of Pindar, but he leaves Christ to present the schemes; and while there is abundance of counting and distributing, the result is presented in the most repellent way.

Let us see what he has to tell us in his short chapter of Principles for the Interpretation of the Pindaric Poems—at the risk of repeating the preface. Scarcely another poet of antiquity is so difficult as Pindar. The ancients soon lost the key which Mezger has just found, and had little relish for him. He was studied in the schools, annotated, praised, but little understood. It is rarely the case even to-day that two interpreters agree in their exposition of any one of his odes. Things have been better since Boeckh and Dissen showed how to handle the myth in Pindar ; but the lack of an objective basis is felt. Pindar composed his poems for oral delivery, and consequently wished to be understood at once. But even to his contemporaries, in spite of all their advantages, the immediate comprehension of his poems would have been impossible, if they had not had some outside help. Of these extraneous aids, three, melody, musical accompaniment, and dance, are lost for us irrecoverably. But there was a tradition, a fixed norm for such compositions, a τεϑμός from which the *epinikion* must not vary, a τεϑμός not only for the contents, but

also for the form. To be sure, the old interpreters in their blindness knew nothing of this; but Boeckh and Dissen observed certain laws of structure, certain recurrences, certain symmetrical responses. Thiersch proved the triple division προκώμιον, μέσον τοῦ ᾄσματος, ἐπικώμιον; but it was reserved for Westphal to set forth and establish the proposition that Aeschylus in the composition of his choruses, and Pindar in that of his *epinikia*, followed the νόμος of Terpander with its sevenfold division.[1] This Mezger considers Westphal to have made evident for all the forty-four odes except eight, at least so far as the three principal parts are concerned, and these principal parts are — hear, O Heavens, and give ear, O Earth!—beginning, middle, and end ! The seven principal parts are according to Westphal's emendation of the passage in Pollux 4, 66—προοίμιον (ἐπαρχά rejected by Westphal is retained by Mezger)—ἀρχά—κατατροπά—ὀμφαλός — μετακατατροπά—σφραγίς—ἐξόδιον. An *epinikion* that has all its parts is provided with seven members. Westphal himself seems to be fully aware that the lover of Pindar will rebel against the thought that the great poet worked by a mere mechanical rule ; but his theory has been accepted by sundry Pindaric scholars, and I would say at once, forsaking Mezger for a while, that I do not mean to imply that there is nothing in it. I have a great respect for the number seven. We know, for instance, that the *parabasis* of comedy was made up of μέλος, παράβασις, μακρόν, στροφή, ἐπίρρημα, ἀντιστροφή, ἀντεπίρρημα, though no one, I believe, has ever suggested a Terpandrian origin for that. Given beginning, middle, end, which we can get from Aristotle (Poet. c. 7) if they are denied by nature, it is easy to expand them into seven, as it is easy to contract the seven into three. The *parabasis*, as we all know, was seldom complete and there is often a missing member in the Terpandrian νόμος. Even in prose it would not be difficult to arrange speeches—say the speeches of Demosthenes— into Terpandrian schemes. Of προοίμιον—ἀρχά—ὀμφαλός—σφραγίς and ἐπίλογος we are sure in advance, and it would go hard if we could not rake up even an ἐπαρχά for Mezger's comfort, to say nothing of a trifling κατατροπά and μετακατατροπά. In the Philippics it would also be easy to get up the due number of mnemonic words in which Φίλιππος and 'Αθηναῖοι, might, it is true, be suspiciously prominent. If we are going into heptads and triads and tetrads, there is simply no end. The three angles of the pediment of a Greek temple will give us a triad ; and so we get our scheme for Ol. VI, the poem of the πρόθυρον. The human body may be considered a heptad of head, arms, chest, navel, feet, in which due prominence will be given to the artistic and Delphic ὀμφαλός ; and this will answer for Nem. VI, in which Pindar says that he is not a statuary—a sufficiently good reason in the eyes of some commentators for making him one. There are Greek poems in the form of panpipes, axes, eggs, wings, altars—not a very noble style of composition. And yet such an outer mechanism is hardly worse than the inner mechanism which is here set up. The egg with its wonderful Eros-symbolism, in which the yolk would of course represent the myth, might be taken as the type of the Pindaric ode with quite as much advantage as the Terpandrian νόμος.

But to return to our guide through these circles of the Pindaric poems. The ὀμφαλός of the Pindaric *epinikion* is the organic centre of the poem, and

---

[1] J. H. H. Schmidt has attacked the ' Terpandrian composition' in his usual unrestrained fashion, Kunstformen Bd. IV. 636 fgg. See also Croiset, Pindare, 126 sqq.

contains a mythus. To be sure there are exceptions—and such exceptions!—
Py. I and IX and Nem. I. The beginning (ἀρχά) and the close (σφραγίς)
regularly contain the praises of the victor and of his house. Then there are
transitions mediating between the προοίμιον and the ὀμφαλός (just as in oratory
the προκατασκευή prepares for the διήγησις) and between the ὀμφαλός and the
σφραγίς. I am at a loss to see anything in this except the rhetorical arrange-
ment naturally indicated by the theme, and cannot refrain from asking, What
is gained by the hard names?

At the same time I would not for a moment have it understood that I am
opposed to investigations into the symmetry of antique compositions. The
trouble is that this theory gives no symmetry. The elements of the Terpan-
dian composition emerge at the most irregular intervals and the distribution
offends against all sense of proportion. Take one of Blass's rhythmical
analyses of a *prooimion* of Demosthenes and one of Mezger's exhibits of the
composition of a Pindaric ode. You may not agree with Blass, but there is
an architectonic principle in the one, while it is utterly incredible that we
should have such proportions as:

O I: 7 (π.) + 16 (ἀ.) + 4 (κ.) + 69 (ὁ.) + 7 (μ.) + 11 (σ.) + 6 (ε.). (p. 95.)
O III: 5 (π.) + 8 (ἀ.) + 2 (κ.) + 18 (ὁ) + 4 (μ.) + 4 (σ.) + 4 (ἑ.). (p. 175.)
O XIII: 23 (π.) + 6 (ἐπ.) + 17 (ἀ.) + 6 (κ.) + 40 (ὁ.) + 5 (μ.) + 16 (σ.) +
2 (ἑ.). (p. 459).
P I: 28 (π.) + 14 (ἀ.) + 3 (κ.) + (12 + 3 + 20) (ὁ.) + 4 (μ.) + 14 (σ.) +
2 (ἑ.). (p. 83.)

Contrast this with Blass's analysis of the *prooimion* of De Corona (§ 1–8):

I. § 1–2.	II. 3–4.	III. 5–6.	IV. 7–8.
3. 2 | 2. 3 | 3. 3	4. 4 | 3. 5 | 5. 3	2. 4 | 4 | 4 | 4. 2	2. 2. 2. 2 | 2. 2. 2. 2
= 16	= 24	= 24	= 8 = 8
			= 16

But Mezger is not satisfied with adopting Westphal's Terpandrianisms.
He out-Westphals Westphal, and comes back to what he has announced in his
preface as his great discovery: the recurrence of certain significant words in
the same place of strophe and antistrophe—the said recurrences being intended
to mark the transition. So the Τλαπολέμου of Ol. VII 20 comes back to us
in the Τλαπολέμῳ of v. 77, thus circling the myth, and in Ol. VIII 28 πράσσων
recurs in the form πράξαις v. 73; and in the ἐπαρχά the word εὐπραγίας stands
in *almost* the same position. In Py. I we have ἔλπομαι in the κατατροπά v.
43 and ἐλπίδας in the μετακατατροπά v. 43. In Ol. I the ἀρχά ends with λάμπει
δέ οἱ κλέος ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικία v. 23, and v. 96 the myth
closes with the words τὸ δὲ κλέος τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις
Πέλοπος.

Such evidence as this—and these are among the strongest 'proofs'—falls
very far short of establishing a principle of composition. The recurrence of a
poet in the cycle of this thought to the point from which he set out is natural
enough. It is the poetic Q. E. D. Significant words may shine out at inter-
vals as brightly as the *stelle* with which Dante ends alike Inferno, Purgatorio,
and Paradiso, but the art which we are called on to admire here, if established,
would not be much more elevated than that of an acrostic.

But I shall take another occasion to discuss the principles of Pindaric com-
position. The true plan is not to take a concordance and look out recurrent
words. The true plan is to work patiently and lovingly after the poet himself.
The historical interpretation, as everybody can see, has been overdone. Per-
haps it is impossible to understand the poet as well without the historical lore
that has been gathered about the odes since the time of Boeckh, but it is
perfectly possible to misunderstand the poet by reason of historical lore. Even
Boeckh's clear eye was confused at times by seeing too much, and his friend
Dissen has been guilty of many utterly absurd over-interpretations of details,
some utterly impossible, utterly unhistorical expositions of entire poems.
Nowadays the tendency to emphasize the formal side of Pindaric art is pushed
to an extreme that is calculated to narrow rather than widen the circle of
Pindar's admirers. If it had not been for his discovery, Professor Mezger
might have done much to help forward the good cause. He knows how to
make his annotations brief, except when he gets on the theme of the recurrent
word ; but he has wasted much space in literal translations of expressions that
translate themselves, and not satisfied with his own renderings, he reproduces
many of Fennell's in the original English, as if that helped the matter much.
I open the book at random and find the following notes on one page, 199, Py.
XII, 10 foll.: δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ " bei der leidvollen Qual"; v. 11 τρίτον
ἄνυσσεν κασιγνητᾶν μέρος: " er machte dem dritten Theil der Schwestern den
Garaus "—which to my perception of German is about equivalent in this con-
nexion to : he did the job for the third part of the sisters, v. 12 μοῖραν ἄγων : den
Tod bringend ; v. 14 λυπρόν—ϑῆκε : in Trauer verwandelte er dem Polydektes
den Mahlesbeitrag ; v. 19 πάμφωνον: vollklingend ; v. 21 χριμφϑέντα : hervor-
gestossen—σὺν ἔντεσι: mit den Instrumenten ; v. 23 κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον:
die vielköpfige Weise. This kind of annotation reminds an American of the
Saturnian reign of Dr. Anthon.

B. L. G.

WORKS OF SPYRIDON A. LAMBROS.

1. Αἱ 'Αϑῆναι περὶ τὰ τέλη τοῦ δωδεκάτου αἰῶνος κατὰ πηγὰς ἀνεκδότους.
Διατριβὴ ἐπὶ ὑφηγεσίᾳ τοῦ μαθήματος τῆς 'Ελλ' 'Ιστορίας ἐν τῷ 'Εϑνικῷ Πανεπιστη-
μίῳ, ὑπο Σπυρ. Π. Λάμβρου, Δ. Φ. 'Αϑήνσι, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφίας τῆς Φιλοκαλίας
1878. 8 vo. pp. viii, 141.

2. Μιχαὴλ 'Ακομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ Σωζόμενα, τὰ πλεῖστα ἐκδιδόμενα νῦν τὸ
πρῶτον κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ, 'Οξωνίῳ, Παρισίοις, Βιέννῃ κώδικας. Δαπάνῃ τοῦ
δήμου 'Αϑηναίων, ὑπὸ Σπυρίδωνος Π. Λάμβρου, Δ. Φ., ὑφηγ. τῆς 'Ελλ' ἱστορίας καὶ
γραφογνωσίας ἐν τῷ ἐϑνικῷ Πάνεπιστημίῳ. Τόμος Α', περιέχων τὰς ὁμιλίας καὶ τὰ
προσφωνήματα. 'Εν 'Αϑήναις, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Παρνασσοῦ, 1879 8 vo. pp. lxxii,
368: Τόμος Β', περιέχων τὰς ἐπιστολὰς καὶ τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ Μιχαὴλ, τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν
ἐπιστολὰς τοῦ Νέων Πατρῶν Εὐϑυμίου τοῦ Τορνίκη, Γρηγορίου 'Αντιόχου καὶ Γεωργίου
Τορνίκη, σημειώσεις ἱστορικὰς καὶ γραμματικὰς καὶ πίνακας, οἷς προσηρτήϑησαν καὶ
φωτοτυπικὰ πανομοιότυπα τῶν κωδίκων. Ibid. 1880, 8 vo., pp. 660, xxviii.

3. Collection de Romans grecs en langue vulgaire et en vers, publiés pour la
première fois d'après les manuscrits de Leyde et d'Oxford, par Spyridion P.
Lambros, Docteur-ès-lettres, Professeur agrégé d'Histoire grecque et de Paléo-